No actions bind that man who through spiritual discrimination hath renounced action and cut asunder all doubt by knowledge. —*The Bhagavad-Gita*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 57 JULY, 1969 NUMBER 9

THE CAUSE OF THEOSOPHY

A GREAT many questions are arising out of the turbulence and swift-moving change of the present cycle, but none is more insistent than those which relate to what used to be called the Social Question. Age-old injustices are no longer taken for granted as inevitable; the habitual crimes of man against man produce a continuous sense of moral outrage; and if the solutions proposed often seem little better than the ostensible causes of all this suffering, the reality of the concern which inspires such desperate remedies is surely a sign of moral awakening.

H. P. Blavatsky addressed herself directly to all such problems when, in "Let Every Man Prove his own Work," she wrote:

> Our great towns hide in their slums thousands of beings whose history would form an inexplicable enigma, a perfectly baffling moral picture, could they be written out clearly, so as to be intelligible. But they are only known to the devoted workers among the outcast classes, to whom they become a sad and terrible puzzle, not to be solved, and therefore, better not discussed. Those who have no clue to the science of life are compelled to dismiss such difficulties in this manner, otherwise they would fall, crushed beneath the thought of them. The social question, as it is called, the great deep waters of misery, the deadly apathy of those who have power and possessions—these things are hardly to be faced by a generous soul who has not reached to the great idea of evolution, and who has not guessed at the marvelous mystery of human development.

It seems considerably more than a speculation to suggest that one of the meanings of the present cycle—with its riots and "confrontations," its angry settlements of past-due accounts, and the bitter charges exacted for what seem very small lessons from "experience"—is that heightened awareness of so much unnecessary human suffering will drive men to inquire more deeply into this mystery. It is no accident that the cycle also includes determined questioning into the nature of "identity," that the capacity to place oneself in the position of another is increasingly seen as essential to useful work for others, and that "love," for all the shallow and sentimental things said about it, is beginning to be recognized as the ground of all elemental decencies in human life.

When circumstances themselves press upon humankind the crucial importance of psychological discovery, and when the failures of politics draft the negative credo of men becoming able to read at least the elementary instructions of history, then, surely, the time has come for persistent reaching after truths evident only on subtler planes of causation. And it is surely not unfitting to speak of such a transition as indicative of some kind of broad "initiation" of mankind in the mass. The import of H.P.B.'s *Five Messages to the American Theosophists* suggests as much.

So there may be particular historical reasons, now, for attending even more closely to the directions of the Teacher:

> The Theosophist is placed in a different position from any of these persons, because he has heard of the vast scope of life with which all mystic and occult writers and teachers deal, and he has been brought very near to the great mystery. Indeed, none, though they may have enrolled themselves as Fellows of the Society, can be called in any serious sense Theosophists, until they have begun to consciously taste in their own persons, this same mystery; which is, indeed, a law inexorable, by which man lifts himself by degrees from the state of a beast to the glory of a God. The rapidity with which this is done is different with every living soul; and the wretches who hug the primitive taskmaster, *misery,* choose to go slowly through a tread-mill course which may give them innumerable lives of physical sensation —whether pleasant or painful, well-beloved because tangible to the very lowest senses. The Theosophist who desires to enter upon occultism takes some of Nature's privileges into his own hands by that very wish, and soon discovers that experiences come to him with double-quick rapidity. His business is then to recognize that he is under a—to him—new and swifter law of development, and to snatch at the lessons that come to him.

Different *kinds* of lessons are doubtless available from this accelerated process, and the ripening of karmic cycles in the present must diversify the harvest as well as exacerbate the pain. It seems worth while to note that nowhere more clearly than in this article does H.P.B. assert the impossibility of pursuing inner development apart from a life of altruism and self-sacrifice. One could say that, from beginning to end, her Mission was characterized by this unmistakable identification of the cause of Theosophy with the cause of all mankind.

Certain it is that the conditions under which a universal brotherhood of man can be realized will have to be *created* by human decision—they will not grow of themselves. There is no hint of anything else in this article. Yet the need of wisdom in action receives equal emphasis; and one may reflect that only in the teachings of Theosophy is this emphasis to be found. As H.P.B. says:

> None know more keenly and definitely than they [Theosophists] that good works are necessary; only these cannot be rightly accomplished without knowledge. Schemes for universal Brotherhood, and the redemption of mankind, might be given out plentifully by the great adepts of life, and would be mere dead-letter utterances while individuals remain ignorant, and unable to grasp the great meaning of their teachers. To Theosophists we say, let us carry out the rules given us for our society before we ask for any further schemes or laws. To the public and our critics we say, try to understand the value of good works before you demand them of others, or enter upon them rashly yourselves. Yet it is an absolute fact that without good works the spirit of brotherhood would die in the world; and this can never be. Therefore is the double activity of learning and doing most necessary; we have to do good, and we have to do it *rightly,* with knowledge.

These are days when some of the mysteries of the human heart in general may become a little less mysterious, through open exposure to the agonies of masses of men. And if there is anything to be learned from the scope of present disorders, it is that no exemptions will be afforded to any class, group, or nation. All will participate in the common struggle, and all will suffer the sickness of the world. History has prepared and time now matures the instruction of our century—the fact, the truth, the law, that humanity is *one*.

THE ESOTERIC SHE

The Late Mme. Blavatsky—A Sketch of Her Career

[The following article by William Quan Judge was first printed in the New York *Sun,* September 26, 1892, together with the famous "*Sun* retraction." That newspaper, in 1890, ran an article by Dr. Coues in which H. P. Blavatsky, the Theosophical Society, and various of its members were grossly misrepresented. The bitterness of his attack measures the hold of ambition upon his nature, and his article (which covers a whole newspaper page in small type), by reason of its vicious falsehoods and defamation of character, has been a fertile source for slanders against H.P.B. from that day to this.

Since it is likely, as recent events show, that such rehashes of stale untruths will find their way into print, Mr. Judge's calm and yet forceful statement on "The Esoteric She" is an object lesson in constructive propaganda. His title sets the keynote of his discussion, for it calls attention immediately to the inviolability of H.P.B.'s *real* life.—Editors, Theosophy]

A WOMAN who, for one reason or another, has kept the world—first her little child world and afterward two hemispheres—talking of her, disputing about her, defending or assailing her character and motives, joining her enterprise or opposing it might and main, and in her death being as much telegraphed about between two continents as an emperor, must have been a remarkable person. Such was Mme. Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, born under the power of the holy Tzar, in the family of the Hahns, descended on one side from the famous crusader, Count Rottenstern, who added Hahn, a cock, to his name because that bird saved his life from a wily Saracen who had come into his tent to murder him.

Hardly any circumstance or epoch in Mme. Blavatsky's career was prosaic. She chose to be born into this life at Ekaterinoslaw, Russia, in the year 1831, when coffins and desolation were everywhere from the plague of cholera. The child was so delicate that the family decided upon immediate baptism under the rites of the Greek Catholic Church. This was in itself not common, but the ceremony was—under the luck that ever was with Helena—more remarkable and startling still. At this ceremony all the relatives

are present and stand holding lighted candles. As one was absent, a young child, aunt of the infant Helena, was made proxy for the absentee, and given a candle like the rest. Tired out by the effort, this young proxy sank down to the floor unnoticed by the others, and, just as the sponsors were renouncing the evil one on the babe's behalf, by three times spitting on the floor, the sitting witness with her candle accidentally set fire to the robes of the officiating priest, and instantly there was a small conflagration, in which many of those present were seriously burned. Thus amid the scourge of death in the land was Mme. Blavatsky ushered into our world, and in the flames baptized by the priests of a Church whose fallacious dogmas she did much in her life to expose.

She was connected with the rulers of Russia. Speaking in 1881, her uncle, Gen. Fadeef, joint Councillor of State of Russia, said that, as daughter of Col. Peter Hahn, she was granddaughter of Gen. Alexis Hahn von Rottenstern Hahn of old Mecklenburg stock, settled in Russia, and on her mother's side daughter of Hèlene Fadeff and granddaughter of Princess Helena Dolgorouky. Her maternal ancestors were of the oldest families in Russia and direct descendants of the Prince or Grand Duke Rurik, the first ruler of Russia. Several ladies of the family belonged to the imperial house, becoming Czarinas by marriage. One of them, a Dolgorouky, married the grandfather of Peter the Great, and another was betrothed to Czar Peter II. Through these connections it naturally resulted that Mme. Blavatsky was acquainted personally with many noble Russians. In Paris I met three princes of Russia and one well-known General, who told of her youth and the wonderful things related about her then; and in Germany I met the Prince Emile de Wittgenstein of one of the many Russo-German families, and himself a cousin to the Empress of Russia and aide-de-camp to the Czar, who told me that he was an old family friend of hers, who heard much about her in early years, but, to his regret, had never had the fortune to see her again after a brief visit made with her father to his house. But he joined her famous Theosophical Society by correspondence, and wrote, after the war with Turkey, that he had been told in a letter from her that no hurt would come to him during the campaign, and such turned out to be the fact.

As a child she was the wonder of the neighborhood and the terror of the simpler serfs. Russia teems with superstitions and omens, and as Helena was born on the seventh month and between the 30th

and 31st day, she was supposed by the nurses and servants to have powers and virtues possessed by no one else. And these supposed powers made her the cynosure of all in her early youth. She was allowed liberties given none others, and as soon as she could understand she was given by her nurses the chief part in a mystic Russian ceremony performed about the house and grounds on the 30th of July with the object of propitiating the house demon. The education she got was fragmentary, and in itself so inadequate as to be one more cause among many for the belief of her friends in later life that she was endowed with abnormal psychic powers, or else in verity assisted by those unseen beings who she asserted were her helpers and who were men living on the earth, but possessed of developed senses that laughed at time and space. In girlhood she was bound by no restraint of conventionality, but rode any Cossack's horse in a man's saddle, and later on spent a long time with her father with his regiment in the field, where, with her sister, she became the pet of the soldiers. In 1844, when 14, her father took her to London and Paris, where some progress was made in music, and before 1848 she returned home.

Her marriage in 1848 to Gen. Nicephore Blavatsky, the Governor of Erivan in the Caucasus, gave her the name of Blavatsky, borne till her death. This marriage, like all other events in her life, was full of pyrotechnics. Her abrupt style had led her female friends to say that she could not make the old Blavatsky marry her, and out of sheer bravado she declared she could, and, sure enough he did propose and was accepted. Then the awful fact obtruded itself on Helena's mind that this could not—in Russia—be undone. They were married, but the affair was signalized by Mme. Blavatsky's breaking a candlestick over his head and precipitately leaving the house, never to see him again. After her determination was evident, her father assisted her in a life of travel which began from that date, and not until 1858 did she return to Russia. Meanwhile her steps led her to America in 1851, to Canada, to New Orleans, to Mexico, off to India and back again in 1853 to the United States. Then her relatives lost sight of her once more until 1858, when her coming back was like other events in her history. It was a wintry night, and a wedding party was on at the home in Russia. Guests had arrived, and suddenly, interrupting the meal, the bell rang violently, and there, unannounced, was Mme. Blavatsky at the door.

From this point the family and many friends testify, both by let-

ter and by articles in the *Rebus,* a well-known journal in Russia, and in other papers, a constant series of marvels wholly unexplainable on the theory of jugglery was constantly occurring. They were of such a character that hundreds of friends from great distances were constantly visiting the house to see the wonderful Mme. Blavatsky. Many were incredulous, many believed it was magic, and others started charges of fraud. The superstitious Gooriel and Mingrelian nobility came in crowds and talked incessantly after, calling her a magician. They came to see the marvels others reported, to see her sitting quietly reading while tables and chairs moved of themselves and low raps in every direction seemed to reply to questions. Among many testified to was one done for her brother, who doubted her powers. A small chess table stood on the floor. Very light—a child could lift it and a man break it. One asked if Mme. Blavatsky could fasten it by will to the floor. She then said to examine it, and they found it loose. After that, and being some distance off, she said, "Try again." They then found that no power of theirs could stir it, and her brother, supposing from his great strength that this "trick" could easily be exposed, embraced the little table and shook and pulled it without effect, except to make it groan and creak. So with wall and furniture rapping, objects moving, messages about distant happenings arriving by aerial port, the whole family and neighborhood were in a constant state of excitement. Mme. Blavatsky said herself that this was a period when she was letting her psychic forces play, and learning fully to understand and control them.

But the spirit of unrest came freshly again, and she started out once more to find, as she wrote to me, "the men and women whom I want to prepare for the work of a great philosophical and ethical movement that I expect to start in a later time." Going to Spezzia in a Greek vessel, the usual display of natural circumstances took place, and the boat was blown up by an explosion of gunpowder in the cargo. Only a few of those on board were saved, she among them. This led her to Cairo, in Egypt, where, in 1871, she started a society with the object of investigating spiritualism so as to expose its fallacies, if any, and to put its facts on a firm, scientific, and reasonable basis, if possible. But it only lasted fourteen days, and she wrote about it then: "It is a heap of ruins—majestic, but as suggestive as those of the Pharaohs' tombs."

It was, however, in the United States that she really began the work that has made her name well known in Europe, Asia, and

America; made her notorious in the eyes of those who dislike all reformers, but great and famous for those who say her works have benefited them. Prior to 1875 she was again investigating the claims of spiritualism in this country, and wrote home then analyzing it, declaring false its assertion that the dead were heard from, and showing that, on the other hand, the phenomena exhibited a great psycho-physiological change going on here, which, if allowed to go on in our present merely material civilization, would bring about great disaster, morally and physically.

Then in 1875, in New York, she started the Theosophical Society, aided by Col. Olcott and others, declaring its objects to be the making of a nucleus for a universal brotherhood, the study of ancient and other religions and sciences, and the investigation of the psychical and recondite laws affecting man and nature. There certainly was no selfish object in this, nor any desire to raise money. She was in receipt of funds from sources in Russia and other places until they were cut off by reason of her becoming an American citizen, and also because her unremunerated labors for the society prevented her doing literary work on Russian magazines, where all her writings would be taken eagerly. As soon as the Theosophical Society was started she said to the writer that a book had to be written for its use. *Isis Unveiled* was then begun, and unremittingly she worked at it night and day until the moment when a publisher was secured for it.

Meanwhile crowds of visitors were constantly calling at her rooms in Irving place, later in Thirty-fourth street, and last in Forty-seventh street and Eighth avenue. The newspapers were full of her supposed powers or of laughter at the possibilities in man that she and her society asserted. A prominent New York daily wrote of her thus: "A woman of as remarkable characteristics as Cagliostro himself, and one who is every day as differently judged by different people as the renowned Count was in his day. By those who know her slightly she is called a charlatan; better acquaintance made you think she was learned; and those who were intimate with her were either carried away with belief in her power or completely puzzled." *Isis Unveiled* attracted wide attention, and all the New York papers reviewed it, each saying that it exhibited immense research. The strange part of this is, as I and many others can testify as eyewitnesses to the production of the book, that the writer had no library in which to make researches and possessed no notes of in-

vestigation or reading previously done. All was written straight out of hand. And yet it is full of references to books in the British Museum and other great libraries, and every reference is correct. Either, then, we have, as to that book, a woman who was capable of storing in her memory a mass of facts, dates, numbers, titles, and subjects such as no other human being ever was capable of, or her claim to help from unseen beings is just.

In 1878, *Isis Unveiled* having been published, Mme. Blavatsky informed her friends that she must go to India and start there the same movement of the Theosophical Society. So in December of that year she and Col. Olcott and two more went out to India, stopping at London for a while. Arriving in Bombay, they found three or four Hindoos to meet them who had heard from afar of the matter. A place was hired in the native part of the town, and soon she and Col. Olcott started the *Theosophist,* a magazine that became at once well known there and was widely bought in the West.

There in Bombay and later in Adyar, Madras, Mme. Blavatsky worked day after day in all seasons, editing her magazine and carrying on an immense correspondence with people in every part of the world interested in theosophy, and also daily disputing and discussing with learned Hindoos who constantly called. Phenomena occurred there also very often, and later the society for discovering nothing about the psychic world investigated these, and came to the conclusion that this woman of no fortune, who was never before publicly heard of in India, had managed, in some way they could not explain, to get up a vast conspiracy that ramified all over India, including men of all ranks, by means of which she was enabled to produce pretended phenomena. I give this conclusion as one adopted by many. For any one who knew her and who knows India, with its hundreds of different languages, none of which she knew, the conclusion is absurd. The Hindoos believed in her; said always that she could explain to them their own scriptures and philosophies where the Brahmins had lost or concealed the key; and that by her efforts, and the work of the society founded through her, India's young men were being saved from the blank materialism which is the only religion the West can ever give a Hindoo.

In 1887, Mme. Blavatsky returned to England, and there started another theosophical magazine, called *Lucifer,* and immediately stirred up the movement in Europe. Day and night there, as in

New York and India, she wrote and spoke, incessantly corresponding with people everywhere, editing *Lucifer,* and making more books for her beloved society, and never possessed of means, never getting from the world at large anything save abuse wholly undeserved. *The Key to Theosophy* was written in London, and also *The Secret Doctrine,* which is the great text book for Theosophists. *The Voice of the Silence* was written there, too, and is meant for devotional Theosophists. Writing, writing, writing from morn till night was her fate here. Yet, although scandalized and abused here as elsewhere, she made many devoted friends, for there never was anything half way in her history. Those who met her or heard of her were always either staunch friends or bitter enemies.

The Secret Doctrine led to the coming into the society of Mrs. Annie Besant, and then Mme. Blavatsky began to say that her labors were coming to an end, for here was a woman who had the courage of the ancient reformers and who would help carry on the movement in England unflinchingly. *The Secret Doctrine* was sent to Mr. Stead of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to review, but none of his usual reviewers felt equal to it and he asked Mrs. Besant if she could review it. She accepted the task, reviewed, and then wanted an introduction to the writer. Soon after that she joined the society, first fully investigating Mme. Blavatsky's character, and threw in her entire forces with the Theosophists. Then a permanent London headquarters was started and still exists. And there Mme. Blavatsky passed away, with the knowledge that the society she had striven so hard for at any cost was at last an entity able to struggle for itself.

In her dying moments she showed that her life had been spent for an idea, with full consciousness that in the eyes of the world it was Utopian, but in her own necessary for the race. She implored her friends not to allow her then ending incarnation to become a failure by the failure of the movement started and carried on with so much of suffering. She never in all her life made money or asked for it. Venal writers and spiteful men and women have said she strove to get money from so-called dupes, but all her intimate friends know that over and over again she has refused money; that always she has had friends who would give her all they had if she would take it, but she never took any nor asked it. On the other hand, her philosophy and her high ideals have caused others to try to help all those in need. Impelled by such incentive, one rich Theosophist gave her $5,000 to found a working girls' club at Bow,

in London, and one day, after Mrs. Besant had made the arrangements for the house and the rest, Mme. Blavatsky, although sick and old, went down there herself and opened the club in the name of the society.

The aim and object of her life were to strike off the shackles forged by priestcraft for the mind of man. She wished all men to know that they are God in fact, and that as men they must bear the burden of their own sins, for no one else can do it. Hence she brought forward to the West the old Eastern doctrines of karma and reincarnation. Under the first, the law of justice, she said each must answer for himself, and under the second make answer on the earth where all his acts were done. She also desired that science should be brought back to the true ground where life and intelligence are admitted to be within and acting on and through every atom in the universe. Hence her object to make religion scientific and science religious, so that the dogmatism of each might disappear.

Her life since 1875 was spent in the unremitting endeavor to draw within the Theosophical Society those who could work unselfishly to propagate an ethics and philosophy tending to realize the brotherhood of man by showing the real unity and essential non-separateness of every being. And her books were written with the declared object of furnishing the material for intellectual and scientific progress on those lines. The theory of man's origin, powers, and destiny brought forward by her, drawn from ancient Indian sources, places us upon a higher pedestal than that given by either religion or science, for it gives to each the possibility of developing the godlike powers within and of at last becoming a co-worker with nature.

As every one must die at last, we will not say that her demise was a loss; but if she had not lived and done what she did humanity would not have had the impulse and the ideas toward the good which it was her mission to give and to proclaim. And there are to-day scores, nay, hundreds of devout, earnest men and women intent on purifying their own lives and sweetening the lives of others, who trace their hopes and aspirations to the wisdom-religion revived in the West through her efforts, and who gratefully avow that their dearest possessions are the result of her toilsome and self-sacrificing life. If they, in turn, live aright and do good, they will be but illustrating the doctrine which she daily taught and hourly practised.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

letters • questions • comment

Speech is a power of almost incredible scope, yet it is a power over which we exercise little conscious control. Most speech seems to be worthless, even when not actually harmful. If mankind is the "crown" of evolution, how is this anomaly to be understood?

Speech is both an active and a passive principle. It is by turns a moving force and its material basis. An analogy illuminating the functions of speech may be found in a passage of *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 188) which describes the evolution of the human foetus through forms representative of the lower kingdoms:

> What is the primitive shape of the future man? A grain, a corpuscle, say some physiologists; a molecule, an ovum of the ovum, say others. If it could be analysed—by the microscope or otherwise—of what ought we to expect to find it composed? Analogically, we should say, of a nucleus of inorganic matter, deposited from the circulation at the germinating point, and united with a deposit of organic matter. In other words, this infinitesimal nucleus of the future man is composed of the same elements as a stone—of the same elements as the Earth, which the man is destined to inhabit. Moses is cited by the Kabalists as authority for the remark that it required earth and water to make a living being, and thus it may be said that man first appears as a stone.
>
> At the end of three or four weeks the ovum has assumed a plant-like appearance, one extremity having become spheroidal and the other tapering like a carrot. Upon dissection it is found to be composed, like an onion, of very delicate laminæ or coats, enclosing a liquid. The laminæ approach each other at the lower end, and the embryo hangs from the root of the umbilicus almost like the fruit from the bough. The stone has now become changed, by "metempsychosis," into a plant. Then the embryonic creature begins to shoot out, from the inside outward, its limbs, and develops its features. . . . The embryo develops into an animal-like fœtus—the shape of a tadpole—and, like an amphibious reptile, lives in water and develops from it. Its Monad has not yet become either human or immortal, for the Kabalists tell us that this only occurs at the "fourth hour." One by one the fœtus assumes the characteristics of the human being, the first flutter of the immortal breath passes through its

> being; it moves; and the divine essence settles in the infant frame, which it will inhabit until the moment of physical death, when man becomes a spirit.

If human beings generate for themselves bodies of thought, individually—or even collectively, as suggested by Joseph Glanvil's phrase, "climate of opinion"—such a body, an organism of thought, could be consciously composed from ideas given primitive form by the speech of those who had a common interest and shared it with one another by clothing their ideas in speech. Like the foetus, the organism of thought would live and grow, nourished and protected from harmful influences, until, having passed through various stages, it matures and gives birth to appropriate actions or new ideas; that is, it begins to have a shaping influence on the lives of men. The process of the maturation of ideas is complex, as with the birth of any other entity. It must be cyclic in its numerous aspects, and cannot be hurried or abridged without adverse effects.

Such a body of thought, if it grows from devotion to a cause, would be nourished by the individual thought of each person contributing to it. Strength would come from this heterogeneity no less than from the constancy of its adherents. It would likewise participate in the stabilities and weaknesses of the people composing it. This might be one explanation of the destructive character of gossip, even when not vicious in intent. The vital essence or meaning of an idea may be dribbled out in premature birth by inconsequential chatter. But by consulting one's inner resources, by practicing, that is, some self-reliance, one might bring nourishment to a later consultation with others without dissipating the possibility of insight for all. But perhaps speech serves best when it aims, not to create anything itself or to solve any problems, but to be truly a "living messenger" of thought. Such speech may stimulate in its turn the kind of thinking which enables others to dissolve their own mental and psychic barriers, so that the "ground of intercourse is fully understood."

To be vital, speech need not be contemporary in idiom. Ideas, if they have enough universal content, may be embodied in analogy, allegory, or myth, and may endure and nourish the thought and lives of men over long ages. Madame Blavatsky seems to have made use of all these forms, and more. But as worlds and men are sevenfold, so must be words, deriving, in some sense, their inner nature from the character of those who utter them. So the real

power of any speech, as the strength of any body, must come from the constancy of its likeness to its indwelling spirit.

Mr. Judge, in *Letters That Have Helped Me,* sums up the potency of words in this way:

> Words are things. With me and in fact. Upon the lower plane of social intercourse they are things, but soulless and dead because that convention in which they have their birth has made abortions of them. But when we step away from that conventionality, words become alive in proportion to the reality and purity of the thought that is behind them. So in communication between two students they are things, and students must be careful that the ground of intercourse is fully understood. Let us use with care those living messengers called words.

The early Christians thought of man as fourfold—natural body, spiritual body, soul and spirit. What is the Theosophical explanation of the spiritual body? Does the death of this body close Devachanic life and cause the spirit to gravitate towards terrestrial existence again? Is it as permanent as the spirit or merely a temporary habitation for the latter?

This question was also asked in the April 1889 issue of Lucifer. The editorial reply was as follows:

> In answer to this query, it would seem probable that in the fourfold division of the human being here referred to as that which was adopted by the earliest Christians, the "spiritual body" may be identified with the *Karana Sarira,* or "causal body" of Eastern philosophy. It is the inseparable and co-existent vehicle of the Monad during the periods of manifestation, and is best described, as indicated by its name, as that in which inhere all the *Karmic causes* which have been generated by that "monad."
>
> The exact relation of this causal or spiritual body to the Monad in Devachan has never been clearly explained in any Theosophical Treatise. It would seem probable, however, that during the Devachanic state this vehicle undergoes a process of *involution,* by which it assimilates all the spiritual essence of the experiences passed through during the previous life.
>
> The spiritual body being co-existent with the Monad, cannot die, but it would appear probable that the return to incarnation is caused by the termination of the process of involution just mentioned.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

JESUS: *A True Nazarene*

HISTORY finds the first Christian sects to have been either Nazarenes like John the Baptist; or Ebionites, among whom were many of the relatives of Jesus; or Essenes (Iessaens) the Therapeutæ, healers, of which the Nazaria were a branch. All these sects, which only in the days of Irenæus began to be considered heretical, were more or less kabalistic. They believed in the expulsion of demons by magical incantations, and practiced this method. The *Talmud* indiscriminately calls all the Christians *Nazari*. All the Gnostic sects equally believed in magic. Dunlap shows that Jesus was called *Nazaraios,* in reference to his humble and mean external condition; "for Nazaraios means separation, alienation from other men."

The Jewish Scriptures indicate two distinct worships and religions among the Israelites; that of Bacchus-worship under the mask of Jehovah, and that of the Chaldean initiates to whom belonged some of the *nazars,* the theurgists, and a few of the prophets. The headquarters of these were always at Babylon and Chaldea, where two rival schools of Magians can be distinctly shown. The oldest and the most esoteric of the two being that which, satisfied with its unassailable knowledge and secret power, was content to apparently relinquish her exoteric popularity, and concede her supremacy into the hands of the reforming Darius. The later Gnostics showed the same prudent policy by accommodating themselves in every country to the prevailing religious forms, still secretly adhering to their own essential doctrines.

The real meaning of the word nazar signifies to vow or consecrate one's self to the service of God. The nazars or prophets, as well as the Nazarenes, were an anti-Bacchus caste, in so far that, in common with all the initiated prophets, they held to the spirit of the symbolical religions and offered a strong opposition to the idolatrous and exoteric practices of the dead letter. The *initiated* nazars

---

NOTE.—"The Christian Scheme," begun in November, 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity.

held to the rule [of conventual rites and "the virtues"] which had to be followed before them by the adepts of every age; and the disciples of John were but a dissenting branch of the Essenes. Therefore, we cannot well confound them with all the nazars spoken of in the Old Testament.

The Nazireate sect existed long before the laws of Moses, and originated among people most inimical to the "chosen" ones of Israel, viz., the people of Galilee, the ancient *olla-podrida* of idolatrous nations, where was built Nazara, the present Nazareth. It is in Nazara that the ancient Nazoria or Nazireates held their "Mysteries of Life" or "assemblies," which were but the secret mysteries of initiation, utterly distinct in their practical form from the popular Mysteries which were held at Byblus in honor of Adonis. While the true *initiates* of the ostracised Galilee were worshipping the true God and enjoying transcendent visions, what were the "chosen" ones about? . . . We really cannot suppose that the Pagans have ever surpassed the "chosen" people in certain shameful *abominations* of which their own prophets accuse them so profusely. To admit this truth, one hardly needs even to be a Hebrew scholar; let him read the Bible in English and meditate over the language of the "holy" prophets. This accounts for the hatred of the later Nazarenes for the orthodox Jews—followers of the *exoteric* Mosaic Law. . . .

The oldest Nazarenes, who were the descendants of the Scripture *nazars,* and whose last prominent leader was John the Baptist, although never very orthodox in the sight of the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem, were, nevertheless, respected and left unmolested. Even Herod "feared the multitude" because they regarded John as a prophet. But the followers of Jesus evidently adhered to a sect which became a still more exasperating thorn in their side. It appeared as a heresy; for while the nazars of the olden times, the "Sons of the Prophets," were Chaldean kabalists, the adepts of the new dissenting sect showed themselves reformers and innovators from the first. The great similitude traced by some critics between the rites and observances of the earliest Christians and those of the Essenes may be accounted for without the slightest difficulty. The Essenes were the converts of Buddhist missionaries who had overrun Egypt, Greece, and even Judea at one time, since the reign of Asoka the zealous propagandist; and while it is evidently to the Essenes that belongs the honor of having had the Nazarene re-

former, Jesus, as a pupil, still the latter is found disagreeing with his early teachers on several questions of formal observance. He cannot strictly be called an Essene, for reasons which we will indicate further on, neither was he a nazar, or Nazaria of the older sect. What Jesus *was,* may be found in the *Codex Nazaraeus,* in the unjust accusations of the Bardesian Gnostics.

"Jesus is *Nebu,* the false Messiah, the destroyer of the old orthodox religion," says the *Codex*. He is the founder of the sect of the new nazars, and, as the words clearly imply, a follower of the Buddhist doctrine. Moreover, we find the Talmudists holding that Jesus was inspired by the genius of Mercury.

The Nazarene reformer had undoubtedly belonged to one of these sects; though, perhaps, it would be next to impossible to decide absolutely which. But what is self-evident is that he preached the philosophy of Buddha-Sakyamûni. Denounced by the later prophets, cursed by the Sanhedrim, the nazars were secretly, if not openly persecuted by the orthodox synagogue. It becomes clear why Jesus was treated with such contempt from the first, and deprecatingly called "the Galilean." Nathaniel inquires—"Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (John 1:46) at the very beginning of his career; and merely because he knows him to be a *nazar*. Does not this clearly hint that even the older nazars were not really Hebrew religionists, but rather a class of Chaldean theurgists? Besides, as the New Testament is noted for its mistranslations and transparent falsifications of texts, we may justly suspect that the word Nazareth was substituted for that of *nasaria,* or nozari. That it originally read "Can any good thing come from a nozari, or Nazarene," a follower of St. John the Baptist, with whom we see him associating from his first appearance on the stage of action, after having been lost sight of for a period of nearly twenty years. The blunders of the Old Testament are as nothing to those of the gospels. Nothing shows better than these self-evident contradictions the system of pious fraud upon which the superstructure of the Messiahship rests. "This *is Elias* which was for to come," says Matthew of John the Baptist, thus forcing an ancient kabalistic tradition into the frame of evidence (11:14). But when addressing the Baptist himself, they ask him (John 1:16), "Art thou Elias?" "And he saith *I am not*"! Which knew best—John or his biographer? And which is divine revelation?

The motive of Jesus was evidently like that of Gautama-Buddha,

to benefit humanity at large by producing a religious reform which should give it a religion of pure ethics; the true knowledge of God and nature having remained until then solely in the hands of the esoteric sects, and their adepts. As Jesus used *oil* and the Essenes never used aught but pure water, he cannot be called a strict Essene. On the other hand, the Essenes were also "set apart"; they were healers (*assaya*) and dwelt in the desert as all ascetics did.

Baptism is one of the oldest rites and was practiced by all the nations in their Mysteries, as sacred ablutions. Dunlap seems to derive the name of the *nazars* from nazah, sprinkling. The Nazarenes were baptized in the Jordan; and could not be baptized elsewhere . . . and had to fast before as well as after the purification by baptism. Jesus is said to have fasted in the wilderness for forty days, immediately after his baptism. The Jordan baptism need not be shown a substitution for the *exoteric* Bacchic rites and the libations in honor of Adonis or Adoni—whom the Nazarenes abhorred —in order to prove it to have been a sect sprung from the "Mysteries" of the "Secret Doctrine"; and their rites can by no means be confounded with those of the Pagan populace, who had simply fallen into the idolatrous and unreasoning faith of all plebeian multitudes. John was the prophet of these Nazarenes, and in Galilee he was termed "the Saviour," but he was not the founder of that sect which derived its tradition from the remotest Chaldeo-Akkadian theurgy.

The baptism was changed from *water* to that of the Holy Ghost, undoubtedly in consequence of the ever-dominant idea of the Fathers to institute a reform, and make the Christians distinct from St. John's Nazarenes, the Nabatheans and Ebionites, in order to make room for new dogmas. If baptism is the sign of regeneration, and an ordinance instituted by Jesus, why do not Christians now baptize as Jesus is represented as doing, "with the Holy Ghost and with fire," instead of following the custom of the Nazarenes? In making [his] palpable interpolations, what possible motive could Irenæus have had except to cause people to believe that the appellation of Nazarene, which Jesus bore, came only from his father's residence at Nazareth, and not from his affiliation with the sect of *Nazaria*, the healers? Water, fire, and spirit, or Holy Ghost, have all their origin in India.

To assure ourselves that Jesus was a true Nazarene—albeit with ideas of a new reform—we must not search for the proof in the

translated Gospels, but in such original versions as are accessible. Tischendorf, in his translation from the Greek of Luke 4:34, has it, "Iesou Nazarene"; and in the Syriac it reads "Iasous, thou Nazaria." Thus, if we take in account all that is puzzling and incomprehensible in the four Gospels, revised and corrected as they now stand, we shall easily see for ourselves that the true, original Christianity, such as was preached by Jesus, is to be found only in the so-called Syrian heresies. Only from them can we extract any clear notions about what was primitive Christianity. Such was the faith of Paul, when Tertullus the orator accused the apostle before the governor Felix. What he complained of was that they had found "that man a mover of sedition . . . a ringleader of *the sect of the Nazarenes";* and, while Paul denies every other accusation, he confesses that "after the way which they call heresy, *so worship I the God of my fathers."* This confession is a whole revelation. It shows: (1) that Paul admitted belonging to the sect of the Nazarenes; (2) that he worshipped the *God of his fathers,* not the trinitarian Christian God, of whom he knows nothing, and who was not invented until after his death; and, (3) that this unlucky confession satisfactorily explains why the treatise, Acts of the Apostles, together with John's Revelation, which at one period was utterly rejected, were kept out of the canon of the New Testament for such a length of time.

Our Nazarene sect is known to have existed some 150 years B.C., and to have lived on the banks of the Jordan, and on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, according to Pliny and Josephus. But in King's *Gnostics,* we find quoted another statement by Josephus from verse 13, which says that the Essenes had been established on the shores of the Dead Sea "for thousands of ages" before Pliny's time. (King thinks it a great exaggeration and is inclined to believe that these Essenes, who were most undoubtedly Buddhist monks, were "merely a continuation of the associations known as Sons of the Prophets.")

According to Munk the term "Galilean" is nearly synonymous with that of "Nazarene"; furthermore, he shows the relations of the former with the Gentiles as very intimate. The populace had probably gradually adopted, in their constant intercourse, certain rites and modes of worship of the Pagans; and the scorn with which the Galileans were regarded by the orthodox Jews is attributed by him to the same cause.

Munk says that the "Nazireate was an institution established be-

fore the laws of Musah." This is evident; as we find this sect not only mentioned but minutely described in Numbers (chap. 6). In the commandment given in this chapter to Moses by the "Lord," it is easy to recognize the rites and laws of the Priests of Adonis. The abstinence and purity strictly prescribed in both sects are identical. Both allowed their hair *to grow long,* as the Hindu cœnobites and fakirs do to this day, while other castes shave their hair and abstain on certain days from wine. The Prophet Elijah, a Nazarene, is described in II Kings and by Josephus as "a hairy man girt with a girdle of leather." And John the Baptist and Jesus are both represented as wearing very long hair.[1] John is "clothed with camel's hair" and wearing a girdle of hide, and Jesus in a long garment "without any seams" . . . "and very white, like snow," says Mark; the very dress worn by the Nazarene Priests and the Pythagorean and Buddhist Essenes, as described by Josephus.

If we carefully trace the terms *nazar,* and *nazaret,* throughout the best known works of ancient writers, we will meet them in connection with "Pagan" as well as Jewish adepts. Thus Alexander Polyhistor says of Pythagoras that he was a disciple of the Assyrian *Nazaret,* whom some suppose to be Ezekiel. Diogenes Laërtius states most positively that Pythagoras, after being initiated into all the Mysteries of the Greeks and barbarians, "went into Egypt and afterward visited the Chaldeans and Magi"; and Apuleius maintains that it was Zoroaster who instructed Pythagoras.

Were we to suggest that the Hebrew *nazars,* the railing prophets of the "Lord," had been initiated into the so-called Pagan mysteries, and belonged (or at least a majority of them) to the same Lodge or circle of adepts as those who were considered idolaters; that their "circle of prophets" was but a collateral branch of a secret association, which we may well term "international," what a visitation of Christian wrath would we not incur! And still, the case looks strangely suspicious.

---

[1] In relation to the well-known fact of Jesus wearing his hair long, and being always so represented, it becomes quite startling to find how little the unknown Editor of the "Acts" knew about the Apostle Paul, since he makes him say in I Corinthians 11:14. "Doth not Nature itself teach you, that if a *man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?*" Therefore, if the passage is genuine, Paul knew nothing of the prophet whose doctrines he had embraced and for which he died; and if false—how much more reliable is what remains?

on the lookout

Pseudo-Science

That "science" for the masses is sometimes nothing but a manipulation of clichés—often without foundation—is illustrated by *Life's* current advertisement of its latest Nature Library offering—*Early Man.* Appearing in the March *Psychology Today,* the ad shows a string of figures ascending from ape to astronaut, while the text declares:

> The development of man is the greatest drama the world has ever witnessed. Here is the birth of all our history, our art, our religion, our civilization. Here you see emerging all those qualities that made us what we are today . . . that enabled us to descend from the trees and reach for the stars.
>
> The story begins with a handful of men who risked their reputations—and sometimes their lives—to dig out the truth. It gathers force with Darwin's "On the Origin of the Species," which challenged man's whole conception of himself as being above the laws of nature. And it reaches a climax today with scientific methods that can reconstruct a million-year-old story from a few teeth, bone fragments and chipped stones.

Dollo's Law

That the reconstruction of this "million-year-old story" is hardly a simple matter of a few teeth, bone fragments and chipped stones, but a project involving complex sociological overtones, including the challenging of cherished theological shibboleths, which has occupied the best scientific minds for over a century of controversy, and that is still continuing, may be easily seen by a look at the facts. The facts are, for the most part, concealed or distorted by polemics. Yet fair-minded scientists have tried to disentangle them from partisan contentions. Henry Fairfield Osborn, foremost anthropologist of the early part of this century, was compelled by a sense of intellectual integrity to move from enthusiastic support of Darwin's theory of man's origin to rejection of his descent from tree-dwelling

apes, while continuing to subscribe to the theory that both were descended from a common ancestor. He wrote in *Science* for May 20, 1927:

> I believe that this stage did not progress so far as to carry man into a stage approaching that of the anthropoid apes. Dollo has stated the law of the irreversibility of evolution. The brachiating hand of the ape was used as a hook—apes do not grasp a branch with the fingers and thumb but hook the whole hand over the branch, as trapeze workers do today—and the thumb was therefore a grave danger. If man had gone through a prolonged period of brachiating in the branches of trees he would have lost his thumb. . . . I predict that even in Upper Oligocene time we shall find pre-men, and if we find Oligocene pre-man—in Mongolia, for example—that he will have pro-human limbs, not pro-anthropoid ape limbs.

Piltdown Hoax

Dr. Osborn felt that the Piltdown Man—represented by a jaw—vindicated his "Pro-Dawn-Man" theory, involving the common ancestor idea. That both apes and man were indeed of a common origin was concurred in by Madame Blavatsky, though occultists, as she explained, understood this idea in quite a different way from modern scientists. One important implication of Osborn's theory, however, was that it pushed the appearance of man on this planet back at least *sixteen* million years. But in 1953 the British Museum declared the Piltdown man to be a hoax, thus disposing of it as the supposed link in man's transition from the ape. Among the few anthropologists who were sceptical of its authenticity even at the time of its "discovery" in 1911, were Franz Weidenreich, who flatly declared that the jaw was nothing more than that of an orangutan, and Prof. Arthur Keith, of the Royal College of Surgeons, who stated that the man reconstructed by Sir Smith-Woodward would be unable to eat, speak, or even breathe.

Men Before "Man"!

Life seems itself caught in some contradiction when its advertised version of evolution is compared with its own extensive editorial coverage of the discovery by Carleton Coon and Louis Dupree of the bones of "modern men" in an excavation on the shores of the Caspian Sea in 1951. Dupree, a geologist, said the bones could not have been deposited later than 75,000 to 100,000 years ago—that is, about the same time or perhaps even earlier than the

primitive Neanderthal man is said to have existed. The 1951 *Life* story said:

> These bones were amazingly different from those of the subhuman Neanderthal and Piltdown men who lived during this same period. Instead here were modern men, true Homo Sapiens who, if Dupree's geological dating proves correct, shared the earth with primitive creatures once thought to be far below them on the evolutionary tree. The new-found Iranians may emerge as the earliest known direct ancestors of the human race.

Many years ago, by means of a quotation from Sir Charles Lyell, H. P. Blavatsky showed why confusions were bound to result from scientific readings of the geologic record:

> The expectation of always meeting with a lower type of human skull, the older the formation in which it occurs, *is based on the theory of progressive development,* and it *may* prove to be sound; nevertheless we must remember that as yet *we have no distinct geological evidence that the appearance of what are called the inferior races of mankind has always preceded in chronological order that of the higher races.* (*S.D.* II, 721.)

Descending Savagery

And the questions asked by Max Müller in *India* (1883) are still highly pertinent in relation to such discoveries:

> What do we know of savage tribes beyond the *last chapter of their history?* [Cf. this with the esoteric view of the Australians, Bushmen, as well as of Palæolithic European man, the Atlantean offshoots retaining a relic of a lost culture, which throve when the parent Root-Race was in its prime.] Do we ever get an insight into their antecedents. . . . *How have they come to be what they are?* . . . Their language proves, indeed, that these so-called heathens, with their complicated systems of mythology, their artificial customs, their unintelligible whims and savageries, are not the creatures of to-day or yesterday. Unless we admit a special creation for these savages, they must be as old as the Hindus, the Greeks and Romans [far older]. . . . They may have passed through ever so many vicissitudes, and *what we consider as primitive, may be, for all we know, a* RELAPSE INTO SAVAGERY or a corruption of something that was more rational and intelligible in former stages. (*S.D.* II, 721-2).

Yet in the *Life* advertisement this statement occurs:

> In realistic artists' renderings—based on the latest evidence—you'll see what early man looked like in his various stages. You'll learn what he ate and wore . . . what sort of shelter he slept in . . . how he managed with the simplest weapons to kill

elephants and huge bears. You'll see him discovering the uses of fire . . . learning to make tools . . . turning his hand to art . . . developing social and religious awareness.

Read all about it!

Other Witnesses

Among more recent contributions to this controversy is an item in the *Journal* of the American Podiatry Association (September, 1968), calling attention to the discoveries of Louis Leakey and to Frederick Wood Jones' statement that man's foot is a distinctively human specialization. Dr. Leakey's discoveries in Olduvai Gorge and elsewhere have led him to question not only the orthodox estimates of man's age as too low, but also the classic definition of man as being the "only primate that makes and uses tools." He told a University of Southern California audience recently:

> . . . fossil bones, teeth and parts of skulls recently unearthed in Kenya and Uganda indicate that early man already existed in Africa 20 million years ago.
>
> Dr. Leakey pointed out that the widely accepted definition of man as the "tool-making or tool using primate" is no longer valid. Primates are a group of mammals of which man, chimpanzee, gorilla, orangutan and gibbon are prominent members.
>
> Recent observations of chimpanzees living in the wild in Africa reveal that they can use sticks and straws and fashion them into crude tools to help them gather food. And young chimpanzees do not know how to do this; they are taught by their mothers.

Different Evolutionary Paths

> "These observations created a dilemma," Dr. Leakey quipped. "We either had to change the definition of man or invite the chimpanzees to send a representative to the United Nations. We changed the definition."
>
> And man descended along with the apes, not from them, Dr. Leakey said. The recently unearthed fossil bones indicate that both a very early man and a very early gorilla coexisted in Africa 20 million years ago during the Miocene Period.
>
> Even then, both man and gorilla were advancing along different evolutionary paths.

Denying the possibility of man's descending from apes, H.P.B. quotes the French naturalist de Quatrefages (*S.D.* II, 666) on the "law of permanent characterization" which Darwin used to explain much of his research, but abandoned in his speculations on man:

> It is by virtue of this law that *all* the descendants of the first

mollusc have been molluscs; *all* the descendants of the first vertebrate have been vertebrates. It is clear that this constitutes one of the foundations of the doctrine. . . . It follows that two beings belonging to two distinct types can be referred to *a common ancestor,* but the one cannot be the descendant of the other;

Now man and ape present a very striking contrast in *respect to type.* Their organs . . . correspond almost exactly term for term: but these organs are arranged after a very different plan. In man they are so arranged that he is essentially a *walker,* while in apes they necessitate his being a *climber;* . . . There is here an anatomical and mechanical distinction. . . . A glance at the page where Huxley has figured side by side a human skeleton and the sketetons of the most highly developed apes is a sufficiently convincing proof.

Practical and Occult Explanations

H.P.B. adds:

The consequence of these facts, from the point of view of the logical application of the law of *permanent characterizations,* is that man cannot be descended from an ancestor who is already characterized as an ape, any more than a catarrhine tailless ape can be descended from a tailed catarrhine. A *walking animal* cannot be descended from a *climbing* one.

But she explains further that, actually, it was the anthropoids which descended from man. An interesting footnote on this point states:

Let us remember in this connection the esoteric teaching which tells us of Man having had in the Third Round a GIGANTIC APE-LIKE FORM on the astral plane. And similarly at the close of the Third Race in this Round. Thus it accounts for the *human* features of the apes, especially of the later anthropoids—apart from the fact that these latter preserve by *Heredity* a resemblance to their Atlanto-Lemurian sires. (*S.D.* II, 688.)

Biogenetic Law?

In ignoring the ancient Hindu scriptures on the descent of man, scientists may have overlooked a rich source of information. A final quotation will illustrate the scope and complexity of the question, as well as the position of Occult Science, as presented in *The Secret Doctrine,* on the origins of man and the source of his "social and religious awareness":

As proven by Gratiolet, with regard to the cavities of the brain of the anthropoids, in which species that organ develops in an inverse ratio to what would be the case were the corresponding organs in man really the product of the development of the said

organs in the apes—the size of the human skull and its brain, as well as the cavities, increase with the individual development of man. His intellect develops and increases with age, while his facial bones and jaws diminish and straighten, thus being more and more spiritualized: whereas with the ape it is the reverse. In its youth the anthropoid is far more intelligent and good-natured, while with age it becomes duller; and, as its skull recedes and seems to diminish as it grows, its facial bones and jaws develop, the brain being finally crushed, and thrown entirely back, to make with every day more room for the animal type. The organ of thought—the brain—recedes and diminishes, entirely conquered and replaced by that of the wild beast—the jaw apparatus.

An Ape's Case

Thus, as wittily remarked in the French work, a gorilla would have a perfect right to address an Evolutionist, claiming its right of descent from himself. It would say to him, "We, anthropoid apes, form a retrogressive departure from the human type, and therefore our development and evolution are expressed by a transition from a human-like to an animal-like structure of organism; but in what way could *you,* men, descend from us—how can you form a continuation of our genus? For, to make this possible, your organization would have to differ still more than ours does from the human structure, it would have to approach still closer to that of the beast than ours does; and in such a case justice demands that you should give up to us your place in nature. You are lower than we are, once that you insist on tracing your genealogy from our kind; for the structure of our organization and its development are such that we are unable to generate forms of a higher organization than our own."

Man's True Origin

This is where the Occult Sciences agree entirely with de Quatrefages. Owing to the very type of his development man *cannot descend* from either an ape or an ancestor common to both, but shows his origin from a type far superior to himself. And this type is the "Heavenly man"—the Dhyan Chohans, or the *Pitris* so-called, as shown in the first Part of this volume. On the other hand, the pithecoids, the orang-outang, the gorilla, and the chimpanzee *can*, and, as the Occult Sciences teach, *do* descend from the animalized Fourth human Root-Race, being the product of man and an extinct species of mammal—whose *remote* ancestors were themselves the product of Lemurian bestiality—which lived in the Miocene age. The ancestry of this semi-human monster is explained in the Stanzas as originating in the sin of the "Mind-less" races of the middle Third Race period. (*S.D.* II, 682-3.)

One wonders why, if this new book is such exciting fiction (realistic artists' renderings), it is represented as science; or, if it is science, why the publishers do not find out the facts, and stick to them. Perhaps the answer is that the book is a combination of both—it is science-fiction.

One of the Great

Reprinting the obituary of one of the most outstanding scientists of H.P.B.'s day, originally published in 1919, the column, "50 and 100 Years Ago," in the April *Scientific American* reminisces:

> "With the death of Sir William Crookes, which took place on April 4th, the world of science mourns the loss of an investigator who belonged to a type which is very seldom met with in modern times. Nowadays specialization is so intense that it is hard to find a physicist who has done work in more than one or two branches of physics, or a chemist who has done work in more than one or two branches of chemistry, but in Sir William Crookes we have a man who was a direct descendant of the giants of old, men who could turn their attention with equal ease to several of the great divisions of science and achieve work of lasting importance in each. Sir William's striking combination of diverse gifts, keen observation, patient and inexhaustible experimental skill, together with the glowing mind and imagination of a poet, have assured him for all time a settled place in the great list of English men of science."

Prof. Crookes was indeed a man of broad interests including an enduring conviction in the reality of psychic phenomena. He was president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and also of the Society for Psychical Research.

"Nothing To Retract"

In an address to the British Association in 1898 he outlined what he thought should be the attitude of science toward psychical research, and stated his own position:

> . . . No incident in my scientific career is more widely known than the part I took many years ago in certain psychic researches. Thirty years have passed since I published an account of experiments tending to show that outside our scientific knowledge there exists a Force exercised by intelligence differing from the ordinary intelligence common to mortals. This fact in my life is, of course, well understood by those who honored me with the invitation to become your president. Perhaps among my audience some may feel curious as to whether I shall speak out or be silent. I elect to speak, although briefly. To enter at length

on a still debatable subject would be unduly to insist on a topic which—as Wallace, Lodge, and Barrett have already shown—though not unfitted for discussion at these meetings, does not yet enlist the interest of the majority of my scientific brethren. To ignore the subject would be an act of cowardice—an act of cowardice I feel no temptation to commit.

"The Fundamental Law"

To stop short in any research that bids fair to widen the gates of knowledge, to recoil from fear of difficulty or adverse criticism, is to bring reproach on science. There is nothing for the investigator to do but go straight on; "to explore up and down, inch by inch, with the taper his reason"; to follow the light wherever it may lead, even should it at times resemble a will-o'-the-wisp. I have nothing to retract. I adhere to my already published statements. Indeed, I might add much thereto. I regret only a certain crudity in those early expositions which, no doubt justly, militated against their acceptance by the scientific world. . . . Were I now introducing for the first time these inquiries to the world of science I should choose a starting point different from that of old. It would be well to begin with *telepathy;* with the fundamental law, as I believe it to be, that thoughts and images may be transferred from one mind to another without the agency of the recognized organs of sense—that knowledge may enter the human mind without being communicated in any hitherto known or recognized ways.

It seems that the qualities of a genuine scientific attitude do not vary much from one age to another, whatever the external trappings. It is also worth noting that the conventional obituary in the *Scientific American* ignored Prof. Crookes' pioneering work in psychic research.

Evidence of Reincarnation

English parents who lost two young daughters in an auto accident have come to believe, through a series of strange coincidences, that both children have reincarnated in the twin girls born to the family seventeen months later. The mother, Mrs. Percival Pollock, told a reporter of the *National Enquirer* (Jan. 26): "There are too many things you just can't explain away. As a Roman Catholic I'm not supposed to believe in reincarnation, but when you come face-to-face with something like this in your own life you can't ignore it." Things noticed or which happened since the twins' birth all pointed to the return of the two girls:

Proof began to accumulate, only a day or two after the twins

were born. First, he [the father] noticed a small brown birthmark about the size of a quarter on baby Jennifer's left hip.

Jacqueline, one of the dead girls, had precisely the same mark in precisely the same spot.

Then, a few weeks later, he noticed a curious white scar, an inch long, on Jennifer's forehead. There was no accident that could have caused it.

Scars and Dolls

But Pollock remembered that Jacqueline had fallen at the age of two and cut her head on the rim of a bucket. The cut had left just such a scar, above her nose.

Pollock said: "I began to think, and think seriously—but I still didn't say a word to my wife."

When the twins were older, Mrs. Pollock herself underwent a weird experience.

She said: "We had kept some of Joanna's and Jacqueline's toys and we decided we might as well give them to Gillian and Jennifer. "There were two dolls, and as soon as she saw the one that had been Jacqueline's, Jennifer held out her arms and said: 'That's my Mary.'

"She had never seen the doll in her life—but it was the one Jacqueline had named Mary.

"And Gillian went for the other doll which had been Joanna's saying: 'Oh, that's my dolly that we had a long, long time ago'."

Explained by Man's Sevenfold Nature

Readers may recall the classic case of Katsugoro, born in the early nineteenth century, whose brief life in another Japanese family, apparently well documented in official records, is related by Lafcadio Hearn (THEOSOPHY, March, 1938). According to Madame Blavatsky (*S.D.* II, 303), the astral monad does not ordinarily reincarnate, the exceptions being "the case of young children, and of individuals whose lives were violently cut off by some accident." Since in the cases of natural death, or death after years sufficient to generate material for normal after-death states, the astral must disintegrate in Kama Loka, a new one being formed after the emergence of the ego from Devachan, memory of past lives could hardly be expected to penetrate the new brain of a child except under extraordinary circumstances, and would even then be difficult to trace or identify. But in instances such as these English girls, where the wearing out of the karmic attractions of earth-life for that incarnation had hardly begun by the time death came

through accident, the use of the same astral body for an almost immediate fresh incarnation is understandable. This would account for the children's memories of their old dolls, and the reappearance of scars which had been imprinted on the astral stuff of their former bodies, perhaps by feelings of pain or other psychic awareness of the hurt. In all such cases, the importance of the teaching of the sevenfold nature of man for explanation of the wonder of memory of past lives, becomes obvious.

"Toy Disarmament"

Token actions, initially insignificant in effect, may lead to a noticeable influence on human attitudes when they are of a sort that can become widespread. The move to discourage war toys, for example, *Readers' Digest* (Dec. 1968) reports, has been taken up by department stores throughout the country. Sears Roebuck and Co., the world's biggest retailer has directed its stores to stop advertising toy guns, and two large stores in New York City have removed existing stocks from their shelves. Meanwhile the largest toy distributor in Maine, Payson Sawyer, as leader of a citizens' group called "Toy Disarmament," has consigned his entire stock of toy guns to the bonfire. "Everybody talks about disarming the world, but we believe a practical step is to start at home," he said. The group is sponsoring a campaign to persuade children to surrender their toy weapons in return for a lapel button bearing the slogan, "I turned mine in."

Ethical Independence

Another campaign reflecting individual moral initiative has been begun by forty-five medical students at Harvard. The students have decided to return bags of valuable diagnostic instruments presented to them as gifts by a pharmaceutical company. According to a *New York Times* report (Feb. 2), the decision was not a sudden one but grew out of reconsideration of an earler decision to accept the gifts:

> The second-year students, who conceded that they had invited the offer last year, said in a statement that "we now feel that we made a mistake and think it proper to return the instruments" to Eli Lilly and Co. of Indianapolis. In a letter to the company, the students said that such gifts undermined the "objectivity" of doctors and medical students because such gifts "engender a sense of familiarity and gratitude" toward those companies that dispense them. . . . "Our aim is to establish good habits for our-

selves early in our training and to promote discussion of the relationship between the drug industry, the medical profession and the patient," the letter said.

Tomorrow's Doctors

This mood on the part of present medical students is not new, gifts having been returned by medical students in other colleges last year. The report continues:

> Richard Pohl, 23 years old, of Lynbrook, L.I., who acted as a spokesman for the [Harvard] group said . . . there were about 125 students in his class, some of whom did not choose to accept the instruments when they were distributed last year. "We want to make this a national issue if possible," Mr. Pohl said, adding that the Harvard group was talking to medical students at Tufts and Boston University in an attempt to have more instruments returned. Last November, 36 students at the Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine in Cleveland returned similar gifts . . . In a letter to the *New England Journal of Medicine,* the Cleveland students said: "We are returning these gifts because we feel they are not gifts but rather are inappropriate advertisements. Although many of these gifts are useful, all but the most naïve realize that your motivation in giving them to us is to influence our future choice of drugs."

Philosophic Poetry

In *Etc.* for last December, Rafael J. Gonzales explores the riches of the Náhuatl poetry of ancient Mexico, showing uses of language which reach far beyond utilitarian objectives:

> According to the Náhuas, it was part of a teacher's duty to "humanize people," for "thanks to him, the love of the people is humanized" (*itech netlacaneco*); he "makes the hearts strong" (*tlayolpatchivitia*). León-Portilla defines the word literally as follows: *yol* (*otl*: heart), *pachivitia* (to make strong), *tla* (with relation to things)—signifying "make hearts strong with relation to things."
>
> What the Náhuas meant by this term becomes more apparent when we piece together the scattered mosaics of their thought in what remains of their literature. It was an attribute of the "mature man" to have a "heart firm as stone." In our own culture such an expression describes an unfeeling, cruel character. But this is not at all what the Náhua meant. The word *yollotl,* heart, comes from *ollin,* movement, this being indicative of life. When "stone" (supreme stillness) is coupled with "heart" (source of movement), we get an image of dynamic stability, and when this stability is "strong with relation to things," we get something like the "unmoving mover," the principle of east-

ern mysticism—a consciousness existing in and with the varied forces of human condition, yet master of itself.

Given the symbol of the jade heart, we are provided with a key to the symbol of Quetzalcoatl, the plumed serpent. A dualistic image, it brings together two diverse principles, the male and the female, analogous to the Yin-Yang. In Náhua mythology the serpent is identified with the mother goddess (Coatlicue), the earth; the bird with masculinity (Huitzilopochtli), the sky, the heroic. In the feathered snake the two principles are united: active and passive, abstract and concrete, positive and negative—the serpent with possibility of flight and the bird which must not lose contact with the earth. It was this unification of opposites that became the patron god of culture, art, knowledge.

Náhuatl Wisdom

"Flowers and song," "jade and fine feathers," "face and heart" . . . as we examine the symbolic meanings and interpretations of these words in the poetry of the Náhuatl people, we realize more and more their genius in coupling two images to express an idea "which would stir in the human mind a *vision*—not abstract and cold like the *Aristotelian idea*—but rich in content, alive, dynamic, and at the same time of universal value." They recognized that language is an intricate and dangerous tool, for, with it, man must capture truth. Words are so many hands with which he must grasp the great butterfly. If he holds it too tightly, he mutilates it; if he holds it too lightly, it escapes him. Perhaps the Náhuas very wisely let it fly between compound terms, trusting that somewhere between the two images one could catch a glimpse of the truth, knowing that its movement and flight are as much a part of itself as the chemical composition of its wings.

It seems quite clear that, even in a declining cycle, these ancients of the New World spoke a language rooted in philosophical subtlety, and that their songs and verse bore internal evidence of what Prescott, as quoted by H.P.B. in "A Land of Mystery," wrote of them. Their code, he said, "evinces a profound respect for the great principles of morality, and as clear a perception of these principles as is to be found in the most cultivated nations."